



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/483,185	01/14/2000	FRANCISCO CORELLA	10991054-1	8069

22879 7590 09/15/2003

HEWLETT PACKARD COMPANY
P O BOX 272400, 3404 E. HARMONY ROAD
INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY ADMINISTRATION
FORT COLLINS, CO 80527-2400

EXAMINER

BROWN, CHRISTOPHER J

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2134

DATE MAILED: 09/15/2003

7

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/483,185

Applicant(s)

CORELLA, FRANCISCO

Examiner

Christopher J Brown

Art Unit

2134

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 9/03/02.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-24 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-24 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Specification

1. The disclosure is objected to because it contains an embedded hyperlink and/or other form of browser-executable code. Applicant is required to delete the embedded hyperlink and/or other form of browser-executable code. See MPEP § 608.01. Said hyperlink is located on page 4 line 15 appropriate corrections are required.

The use of the trademark Windows 2000 has been noted in this application. It should be capitalized wherever it appears and be accompanied by the generic terminology.

Although the use of trademarks is permissible in patent applications, the proprietary nature of the marks should be respected and every effort made to prevent their use in any manner, which might adversely affect their validity as trademarks.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-6, and 13-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chapman US 6,058,484 in view of Lipner US 5,210,795.

2. As per claims 1, and 13, Chapman discloses a certificate authority issuing a long-term public key identity certificate (certificate) that binds a public key of the user to long term

identification information (identifying information) related to the user, (Col 7 lines 57-67).

Chapman does not disclose a short-term public key certificate.

Lipner discloses a computer issuing a short term public key credential certificate (delegation certificate), based partly on information from a directory (disk), (Col 6 lines 40-50). The user presents this short term certificate to an application (server) for authorization, (Col 6 lines 60-65).

It would be obvious to modify Chapman's PKI system with a short term certificate of Lipner to reduce network traffic.

As per claims 2, and 14, Chapman does not disclose a short term certificate.

Lipner discloses that the certificate has a time stamp (current time, validity period).

It would be obvious to modify Chapman's pki system with a timestamp of Lipner to state time of validity and increase security.

As per claim 3, and 15 Chapman does not disclose a short term certificate.

Lipner discloses that the expiration date is sufficiently short (limited amount of time).

As per claims 5, and 17, Chapman does not disclose a short term certificate.

Lipner discloses no methods of revocation.

As per claims 6, and 18, Chapman does not disclose a short term certificate.

Lipner discloses a short term certificate in a non structured form, (Col 6 line45).

As per claims 8, and 20, Chapman discloses using a X.509 certificate, (Col 8 lines 33-43). Chapman does not disclose a shot term certificate.

Lipner discloses a short term certificate, (Col 6 line 42).

It would be obvious to one skilled in the art to modify Chapmans x.509 with Lipners short term certificate, because the 509 format is supported by a number of different protocols, (Col 8 line 43), and the short term certificate need not be checked by CRLs. As per claims 10, and 22, Chapman discloses memory, (Col 9 line 2). The long term certificate must be stored in the directory to be retrieved.

Claims 4 and 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chapman US 6,058,484 in view of Lipner US 5,210,795 in view of Asay US 5,903,882.

3. As per claims 4, and 16, Chapman-Lipner discloses a short term certificates with limited validity.

Asay discloses that a certificate that becomes invalid by age need not be on the schedule thus becomes invalid before the next scheduled CRL check, (Col 3 lines 1-4).

It would be obvious to modify Chapman's PKI system with Asay's CRL to enable reduced network traffic.

Claims 7, 9, 19, and 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chapman US 6,058,484 in view of Lipner US 5,210,795 in view of Howell US 5,276,901.

4. As per claims 7, and 19, Chapman-Lipner discloses a short term certificate.

Chapman-Lipner does not disclose a structured certificate.

Howell discloses a certificate with access restricted folders contained therein (Col 5 lines 23-30).

It would be obvious to one skilled in the art to modify Chapman-Lipner with Howell's restricted access to increase security.

As per claims 9, and 21, Chapman-Lipner discloses using a short term X.509 certificate, (Chapman Col 8 lines 33-43).

Howell discloses restricted folders, (Col 5 line 23).

It would be obvious to one skilled in the art to modify Chapmans x.509 with Howell's restricted folders, because the 509 format is supported by a number of different protocols, (Col 8 line 43), and the restricted folders add a measure of security.

Claims 11, and 23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chapman US 6,058,484 in view of Lipner US 5,210,795 in view of Maruyama US 6,393,563.

5. As per claims 11, and 23 Chapman-Lipner does not disclose a smart card.

Maruyama disclose a private key may be stored on a smartcard, (Col 1 line 20, 53-56).

It would be obvious to modify the Chapman-Lipner combination with Maruyama's smart card, because the smart card increases the security of key storage.

Claims 12, and 24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chapman US 6,058,484 in view of Lipner US 5,210,795 in view of Kausik US 6,263,446.

6. As per claims 12, and 24, Chapman-Lipner does not disclose a software wallet.

Kausik discloses storing a private key in a software wallet, (Col 4 lines1-6).

It would be obvious to modify the Chapman-Lipner combination with Kausik's software wallet because the wallet increases the security of key storage.

Conclusion

7. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Christopher J Brown whose telephone number is 703-305-8023. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30-6:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Gregory Morse can be reached on 703-308-4789. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 872-9306.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-305-3900.

Christopher J. Brown



GREGORY MORSE
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100